

4481.C.54

*The Scripture Account of the Lord's-Supper.*

---

The SUBSTANCE of  
**Three SERMONS**

Preached at  
**MARKET-HARBOROUGH**

In the COUNTY of  
**LEICESTER.**

1755.

---

By **RICHARD PARRY, B. D.**  
Minister of *Market-Harborough*; and  
Student of *Christ-Church*.

---

*Apud Ethnicos & Judæos Instituto veteri receptum erat, ut nec  
Fœdera sine Sacrificio, nec Sacrificium sine Convivio, nec Con-  
vivium sine Poculo quodam Sacratione, fierent. In COENA  
DOMINICA, Fœdus solenne consignaturi, Panem & Vinum  
exhibemus, Sacrificium Verum DEO representamus, Convi-  
vium è Sacris oblatis agimus, Poculum etiam Ovis Sanguis de-  
gustamus. ——— Spencer.*

---

**O X F O R D,**

Printed at the THEATRE for **JAMES FLETCHER** in the  
*Turl*; and Sold by **R. DODSLEY** in *Pall-Mall*, London.

**M DCC LV.**



Imprimatur,

*GEO. HUDDSFORD,*

Vice-Can. *Oxon.*

*Oct. 30. 1755.*



## P R E F A C E.

**A** *Well meant Endeavour to promote the Interests of Christianity, by rescuing one of its most important Institutions from the Extremes of Irreverence and Superstition, can never stand in Need of an Apology. It is the Business of the Clergy to explain as well as to enforce the Duties of their Religion; the Value of which will rise in Proportion as they are understood.*

*If these Papers should chance to fall into the Hands of the Right Reverend Author of The Plain Account, it is humbly hoped that his Lordship will give them an attentive Reading. The Subject is important, and commands his Attention. And I am fully perswaded that, if there is no favourite Hypothesis to serve, whoever seriously believes The Sacrifice of Christ, will be easily and naturally led to this Conclusion — that The Lord's-Supper is a Feast upon it.*

*I really know not any Objection to this Notion of the Lord's-Supper. Some Objections have indeed been urged, with an Air of great Importance, as if they had a mighty Force, though they are utterly impertinent. One, drawn from the Absurdity of supposing the Lord's-Supper to be a Feast upon or*

after the Sacrifice of Christ, before the Sacrifice itself was offered, was obviated by our Saviour himself in the express Words of the Institution. This is my Body which is broken — this is my Blood which is shed. Here he plainly speaks of his Body as actually broken, and of his Blood as actually poured out. And therefore this Rite must necessarily relate to what the Disciples were to do after Jesus was crucified. The Truth is, in whatever Light you consider the Lord's-Supper, you must consider it as relative to an Act already past. View it only as a bare Remembrance of Christ's Death. "The Disciples, as a celebrated Writer will tell you, could not do the Actions here named in Remembrance of any Thing done, which was not then past and done. But after his Death they could. For then, though not before, they could eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of his Body actually given and broken, and of his Blood actually given and poured forth." It is therefore extremely unfair, to urge That as an invincible Objection to one particular Notion of the Lord's-Supper, which is of equal Force against any other.

There is another Objection, which I should have passed over, had not the Author introduced it with much Solemnity, and represented this Notion of the Lord's-Supper, not only as having no Foundation in Scripture, but likewise as subversive of it. The

Author



*Author I mean is the Remarker on Doctor Warburton. He prudently conceals his Name, and assumes the Title of A Country Clergyman. Whoever he be, he is no great Clerk. But he will take upon him to say, that St. Paul could not consider the Lord's-Supper under the Notion, or as having the Nature, of a Feast upon the Sacrifice of the Cross, without being guilty of Self-Contradiction, and subverting the very Foundations of the true Faith in Jesus Christ. A heavy Accusation this! But let us see how he supports it. For the true Faith is, that we believe and confess, that Christ was offered to bear the Sins of many. By which Passage in St. Paul it is plain, says he, that the Death of Christ upon the Cross is of the Nature of a Sacrifice for Sin, the Blood of which was brought into the holy Place to reconcile withal; and therefore by an express Law could not be feasted upon. Admirable Reasoning! The Jews were forbidden by an express Law to feast upon Sin-Offerings — therefore Christians are forbidden by the same Law. But, in the Name of Logic! how does this Author get at his Therefore? Does the Jewish Law bind Christians? Or, if Moses, for particular Reasons, forbade the feasting upon a Sin-Offering, might not Christ, for particular Reasons, injoin it? The single Point in Question is the specific Nature of the Feast. Is the Lord's-Supper*  
*a Feast*



*a Feast upon a Sacrifice? Or, is it not? The specific Nature of the Sacrifice, whether Sin-Offering or Peace-Offering, is quite a distinct Consideration. And if this Objector had been as well acquainted with St. Paul's Writings as he would seem to be, he would not have dared to charge him either with Self-Contradiction, or with the Guilt of subverting the very Foundations of the Gospel, for inculcating this important Notion of the Lord's-Supper. In his Epistle to the Hebrews he expressly tells us, that the Priesthood being changed, there is made of Necessity a Change also of the Law. And again, there is verily a disannulling of the Commandment going before. Christians, as well as Jews, have a Priest and a Sacrifice. But the Law concerning Both is changed. So that the Objection amounts only to this — that the Christian Feast is not a Jewish one. And by the same Method of reasoning, or rather of no-reasoning, the Objector might have gone on and proved, that Christ was neither a Sin-Offering nor a Priest. Because forsooth! he was not slain in the Temple, nor his Blood brought into the holy Place; and because he sprang out of Judah, of which Tribe Moses spake nothing concerning Priesthood. Here our Remarker has fallen into that very Blunder which he would willingly fix upon those fine Writers, Doctor Cudworth and Doctor Warburton, and seems*

*seems to think that two Things cannot be compared together unless they resemble each other in every Respect, and has no Notion of any Similitude, but what, to borrow his own rustic Phrase, crawls on all four. Whereas if they agree in any one principal Respect, if there is a Likeness in any one principal Circumstance, this is sufficient to constitute the Analogy. And this is that perfect Analogy which Doctor Cudworth speaks of between the Christian, Jewish, and Pagan Feasts, that one common Nature which Doctor Warburton ascribes to them. They do not mean, as the Remark-er misrepresents their Meaning, that there must be a perfect Analogy between them in all Points, one common Nature throughout, (they could not but know the contrary) but they mean, that as far as the Analogy holds it must be perfect. And they place the Analogy where the Apostle himself has placed it. Consider his Design and his Argument. He is to prove, that some Corinthian Christians were guilty of Idolatry. As his Medium, he insists upon their eating Things offered in Sacrifice to Idols. Now, says he, eating Things offered in Sacrifice to the true God is confessedly, among Jews and Christians, the Means of communicating with him. This he puts in such an interrogatory Form as amounts to the strongest Affirmation. The Cup — is it not the Communion of the Blood? The*  
*Eread*

*Bread — is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? He does not say, that we communicate with, but of, Christ; of his Body which was broken, and of his Blood which was shed for us. Our Communion is with the Father through the Son. Christ, feasted on in the Lord's-Supper, is the common Link that unites both Parties together. Just as feasting upon the legal Sacrifices was the Means or Bond of Union between God and the Jews. Therefore They, who partake of a similar Feast, and eat Things offered in Sacrifice to Idols, communicate with those Idols. — The Apostle's Argument is so exceeding plain, that he that runs may read it.*

*Let me observe before I leave this Point, that St. Paul, in his Time, might prove the Nature of a Pagan Feast from its Analogy to the Christian Feast. We on the contrary, in these Days, are obliged to prove the true Nature of our Christian Feast from the Analogy which it bears to a Pagan one.*

*After all, it is pleasant to observe, that our Remarker, though he is such a strenuous Opposer of this Notion of the Lord's-Supper as to have writ Six penny-worth of Objections to it, does yet implicitly affirm the same, though he expressly contradicts it. At the Bottom of Page 21 he bids us compare Heb. XIII. 10, 11, 12. and Lev. VI. 30. The*  
two



*two Passages stand thus. No SIN-Offering, whose Blood is brought to reconcile withal in the holy Place, shall be eaten; it shall be burnt in the Fire. — We have an Altar, whereof they have no Right to eat which serve the Tabernacle. For the Bodies of those Beasts, whose Blood is brought into the Sanctuary by the high Priest for Sin, are burnt without the Camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffered without the Gate. The Inference from a Comparison of the two Passages is this — The Lord's-Supper is a Feast upon a SIN-Offering. We Christians, says the Apostle, have an Altar, that is, a Sacrifice, (just as the Term Table is frequently put for the Provision upon it) whereof no Jew, by the express Prohibition of the Law, has any Power to eat. For the Sin-Offerings are intirely burnt without the Camp. Now Jesus, that he might sanctify his People with his own Blood, suffered without the Gate. Jesus therefore is a Sin-Offering. And yet We are allowed to feast upon him. Thus stands the Apostle's Reasoning, if the 10th Verse has any Connection with the 11th and 12th. Else what Advantage has the Christian? If Christians feast only upon a Peace-Offering, the Jews are upon a Level with them. Of this Altar, or Sacrifice, even They might eat. The distinguishing Privilege therefore of Christians*

*above the Jews, from this View of the Passage, consists in this — that feasting upon a Sin-Offering, which was prohibited by the Jewish Law, is allowed and enjoined by the Christian. And thus the Remarker's Reasoning is felo de se, and destroys itself. — This is a striking Instance of that Judgment and Accuracy, for which this Thing is so very particularly commended by the Reviewers.*

*Having mentioned these Monthly Writers, I shall take Notice of a third Objection, which They have been pleased to advance against this Notion of the Lord's-Supper. If there be this Analogy between the Lord's-Supper and that antient Rite among the Jews of feasting upon Things sacrificed, and eating of those Things which had been offered to God; then, by Analogy to this, the Christian Feast must become a real Sacrifice. — It is true. And was not the Christian Feast [upon] a Real Sacrifice, I should be very little solicitous about it. But then let the Objectors know, that the Sacrifice, for which we plead, is That of Christ Once offered on the Cross. — We neither offer a new Sacrifice, nor do we repeat an old one. But we constantly exhibit the One Sacrifice of Christ in a constant Celebration of this Feast upon it. As often as we eat the Bread and drink the Cup, we shew the Lord's Death. — We express visibly, by Actions instead of Words, the Grand Sacrifice of Christ Once offered.*

*ferred. And Christ is no more crucified afresh in the one Mode of Expression than he is in the other.*

*I once intended to have said something in Defence of what I had asserted concerning the Passover mentioned by St. Luke, as the Thought was really my own. But I shall save the Reader and myself this Trouble, having since learned from Doctor Waterland, that this Opinion (viz. that the Passover mentioned by the Evangelist is the Christian Passover, or Lord's-Supper) had some Patrons of old Time, more of late, and seems to gain Ground. — Indeed, whoever duly compares the four Evangelists together will be apt to wonder, how the Critics could ever think of any other.*

*I have nothing more to add, than to desire Those, into whose Hands this plain Discourse may chance to fall, to read it with the same honest Disposition with which it was composed; without any false Bias of Party-Attachment, illiberal Prejudice, or preconceived Opinion; but fairly to allow the Evidence its due Weight; to seek the Truth in the sincere Love of it; and then the Truth shall make them free.*





I C O R. XI. 26.

*For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come.*

**A**S the *Lord's-Supper* is the distinguishing Characteristic of the Disciples of a *Crucified Saviour*, being appointed to "*shew forth his Death till he come,*" it is of the highest Importance to inquire into the true Nature, End, and Design of it. And indeed this is the more necessary, because, what through Knavery or Folly, what from real Superstition on the one Hand, or an affected Abhorrence of Superstition on the other, this Venerable Mystery has been either raised into a Sacrifice, or sunk into a Ceremony. And That, which was intended to unite the Hearts of Christians in one holy Bond of Peace, has proved the unhappy Occasion of dividing their Sentiments, and of alienating their Affections. It hath set the Father against the Son, and the Son against the

the Father. And the greatest Foes to the Lord *Jesus* have been those of his own Household.

Give me Leave therefore, in discoursing on this essential Branch of Christian Worship, to lay before You the Scripture Notion of it. I say, the *Scripture* Notion of it. For if we were to frame our Conceptions of this Sacred Rite from mere human Systems, changeable and various as Times and Writers, we should be, in some Point or other, misled.

The Occasion and Manner of this Holy Institution are recorded, with some little Variation, by *three* of the *Evangelists*. What they have said will be considered hereafter. In the mean Time I shall confine myself to St. *Paul's* Account of it, delivered to him by immediate Revelation from *Christ* himself.

“The Lord *Jesus*, the same *Night*, in which  
 “he was *delivered up*, took Bread, and when he  
 “had given Thanks and blessed, he *brake*, and  
 “said, take, eat; this is my Body which is *bro-*  
 “*ken* for you; Do this for a Memorial of Me.  
 “After the same Manner also (he gave) the Cup,  
 “when he had supped, saying, this Cup is the  
 “new Testament in my Blood; Do this, as oft  
 “as ye drink it, for a Memorial of Me.”

To which the Apostle immediately subjoins, by way of Explanation — “For as often as ye

“eat





“eat this Bread, and *drink* this Cup, ye do *shew*,  
“or significantly express, by these *Actions*, the  
“Lord’s *Death* till he come.”<sup>a</sup>

Hence it plainly appears, that the *Lord’s-Supper* is a *commemorative Representation* of the *Death* of *Jesus*, of his *Body* which was *broken*, and of his *Blood* which was *shed*, for us.

To give You the clearer Notion of this, it will be proper to observe, that Men have two Ways of conveying their Thoughts to each other — by *Words* and by *Actions*. In this Age and Nation the former is chiefly in Use, but the latter is more expressive. For *Actions*, having a *natural* Signification, and moving before the *Eye*, must necessarily make a stronger Impression upon the Mind than *Words*, which have only an *arbitrary* Signification, and enter by the *Ear*.<sup>b</sup>

Accordingly we find, that among the *Eastern Nations* *Action* was the principal Part of Conversation. In this Manner God frequently instructed his Prophets, and the Prophets the People. Thus the Restoration of the Israelites from their Captivity was strongly represented to *Ezekiel*, in a Vision, by a Resurrection of dry

a 1 Cor. XI. 23—26.

b Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem  
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.

Bones.<sup>a</sup> Thus also God acquainted *Peter* with his gracious Design of admitting the Gentiles into his Church, by exhibiting a Variety of unclean Creatures, any of which he was commanded to kill and eat.<sup>b</sup> So again, just after our blessed Master had instituted his Supper, upon a Strife arising among the Twelve which of them should be the *Greatest* in his Kingdom, he taught them by a very expressive *Action*, that of *washing their Feet*, the first and last Lesson of the Gospel — *Humility*.<sup>c</sup>

Hence arose the Use of *Types* in Religion. For Types are nothing else, but *speaking Actions*. These made up the most considerable Part of the Jewish Institution, which was so admirably contrived by its divine Author, that, although it was more immediately calculated to amuse a carnal People with material Images, it had likewise the Shadow of spiritual Things to come. To go through and explain every Branch of this curious System would greatly exceed the Bounds of a single Discourse. At present, therefore, I shall only mention that vital Part of Jewish Worship, the *Paschal Feast*; it being that which, if I may so speak, gave our

<sup>a</sup> XXXVII. 1—14.

<sup>b</sup> *Acts* X. 11—28.

<sup>c</sup> *John* XIII. 4—14.

bleſſed Saviour the Hint of inſtituting his Supper.

The *Paſſover*, in its primary and obvious Intention, was deſigned as a Memorial to the Children of Iſrael of their wonderful Deliverance from Egyptian Bondage. But its principal and moſt important Object was the *Death of Chriſt*, which it prefigured in all its Parts. The Month, the Day, the very Hour, in ſhort, all the moſt remarkable Circumſtances relating to the one were exactly deſcribed and ſhadowed out by the other. Hence we ſee the Truth and Propriety of what Jeſus told the Jews — “the *Law prophesied* ;” that is, it prophesied by *Signs*.<sup>a</sup>

*Signs* then, or Types, or Figures, or Symbols, (call them which You pleaſe) taking up ſo conſiderable a Part of the *old* Diſpenſation, would eaſily and naturally find a Way into the *new*. Of this Kind is the *Lord's-Supper*,<sup>b</sup> in

<sup>a</sup> *Matt. XI. 13.*

<sup>b</sup> *Baptiſm* is likewise of this Kind. — *Buried* with him in *Baptiſm*, wherein alſo ye are *riſen* with him. *Col. II. 12.* = *Rom. VI. 4. 5.* And as this Rite represents the Death of Chriſt in general, ſo our Church has added a ſignificant Circumſtance to deſcribe the particular Manner of it, the Death of the *Croſs*. She does not preſcribe the Uſe of the *Croſs* as a Charm, to operate, I know not how, mechanically on the Perſons baptiſed, but only as an expreſſive Sign, “in token that they ſhall not be a-  
“ſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt *crucified*.” It is amazing



which, as I said before, the *Death* of *Jesus* is represented as well as commemorated ; or, in the emphatic Language of *St. Paul*, “ *Jesus Christ* is “ *evidently set forth crucified among you.*” <sup>a</sup>

But farther — *Eating* and *drinking* are convivial Terms, and the *Lord's-Supper*, as the very Words imply, is a *religious Feast*. And when we reflect, that what we *eat* and *drink* in this holy Supper are the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*, we are naturally led to consider it under the enlarged Character of a *Feast upon a Sacrifice*. *St. Paul* would insinuate this to us, when he takes particular Notice of the *Time* of its Institution, “ the very *Night* in which he was *delivered up* ;” <sup>b</sup> not simply delivered by the Treachery of *Judas*, but by the determinate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God. For unless this was our Saviour's Design in the Institution, we cannot see a sufficient Reason for his making Choice of that particular Time, nor for the sacred Writer's recording it.

that such an innocent Ceremony should stand in Need of an Apology. But since some Persons have been so weak as to stumble at it, it was not improper to say thus much, if not for their Conviction, yet at least for our own Justification.

<sup>a</sup> *Gal. III. 1.*

<sup>b</sup> Παρεδίδετο. = *Rom. IV. 25.* Who was *delivered* (παρεδόθη) for our Offences.

But

But what the Apostle only insinuates in this Place, he expressly asserts in another. "*We have* "an *Altar*, whereof they have no Right to *eat* "who serve the Tabernacle."<sup>a</sup> Here he plainly alludes to the Jewish Custom of *feasting upon the Sacrifice*, and by that means communicating in the Benefits of it; and he speaks of the *Lord's-Supper* under the *same* Notion. His Argument is addressed to certain Judaizers, who were attempting, with strange Inconsistency, to incorporate the burdensome Ceremonies of the Law with the plain, simple Institution of the Gospel. "Be not carried about, says he, with "diverse and strange Doctrines, for it is a good "Thing that the Heart be established with "Grace, not with *Meats*, which have not profited them who have been occupied therein. *We* "have an *Altar*, whereof they have no Right to "eat who serve the Tabernacle." They, who are still in Bondage to the Law, cannot possibly receive any Benefit from the *Cross* of *Christ*, the *Altar*,<sup>b</sup> (as the Apostle styles it) upon which

<sup>a</sup> Heb. XIII. 10.

<sup>b</sup> Reconciled unto God by the *Cross*. Eph. II. 16. having made Peace through the Blood of his *Cross*. Col. I. 20. he bare our Sins in his own Body on the *Tree*. 1 Pet. II. 24. Let me observe, that the 11th Verse, which begins with *for*, is no Proof of what was asserted in the 10th, that Jews have no Right to eat of the Christian Sacrifice, but it is a new Argument to

he made a *Sacrifice of himself*, and of which we Christians are Partakers in the *Lord's-Supper*. The Reason is evident. The Jewish Feasts were prefigurative, looking forward to a future Act of Mercy. The Christian Feast is commemorative, and looketh back upon the same Act of Mercy already past. To communicate therefore in the prefigurative Feasts of the Law was, in Effect, denying that *Jesus Christ* is come, and has been put to Death, in the Flesh; and consequently must exclude such Persons from the Benefits of it. — This seems, to me, to be the true State of the Apostle's Argument. And it amounts to neither more nor less than what he says elsewhere to Persons of the same Stamp. If ye are *circumcised*, if ye depend upon the Law for Righteousness, *Christ shall profit you nothing.*<sup>a</sup>

withdraw the Judaizers from their Attachment to the Law. Now for this he offers two Reasons. 1. They, who adhere to the Law, are excluded from all Benefits of the Christian Sacrifice. 2. Adhering to the Law, whilst they embraced the Gospel, was inconsistent with Jewish Principles. For the legal Dispensation was relative to the Christian as the Type of it. Consequently both Dispensations could not subsist together. Now, says he, you allow, that Christ, suffering without the City, answered to the yearly expiatory Sacrifice burnt without the Camp. *Therefore* let us go to him *without the Camp* — let us abdicate the Law and all its *Typical* Sacrifices, and trust entirely to the Merit of *Christ's Real* Sacrifice, which has superseded and abolished every other.

a Gal. V. 2.

This



This Opinion will receive additional Support from another Passage of our Apostle, relative to the *Lord's-Supper*, and declaring the true Nature of it. It is in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, where he is exhorting them, from this very Topic, to flee from *Idolatry*. At the Beginning of the Chapter he resumes his Discourse on this Subject, which had been interrupted in the preceeding one by something of another Nature, and informs them, that all their Fathers were equally possessed of great invaluable Privileges — “they were all under the Cloud, all “passed through the Sea, were all baptized with “the same Baptism, all ate the same spiritual “Meat, all drank the same spiritual Drink” — and yet, for want of a right Behaviour under those Means of Grace, God was highly displeased with many of them, and overthrew them in the Wilderness. Now these Things, says he, were our Examples, and are to be applied by us for our Admonition, that we should not be *Idolaters*, like some of them, as it is written, the People sat down to *eat* and *drink*, namely, what had been *offered* in *Sacrifice*. Wherefore, from this Instance of Misconduct, in your Forefathers, my dearly beloved, *flee from Idolatry*. I speak as to wise Men, judge ye what I say. You assume and appropriate to yourselves the Character  
of

of wise Men, and I appeal to You as such. Judge ye then, but judge impartially, what I say.

Drinking “the Cup of Thanksgiving, which  
 “we bless, is it not the Communion of the *Blood*  
 “of *Christ*? (Eating) the Bread,<sup>a</sup> which we  
 “break, is it not the Communion of the *Body*  
 “of *Christ*? (So that we, though many, are one  
 “Bread, even one Body, for we are all Parta-  
 “kers of that one Bread — the Body of Christ.)<sup>b</sup>  
 “Behold Israel after the Flesh. Are not they,  
 “who eat of the Sacrifices, Partakers of the Al-  
 “tar? What say I then? that the Idol is any

<sup>a</sup> *Τὸν ἄρτον*. Something is left to be supplied as above.

<sup>b</sup> According to our public Translation St. *Paul* argues in a Circle; first proves a Communion of Christ’s Body from our Union with each other, and then our Union with each other from a Communion of Christ’s Body. The Bread &c. *for — for —*. A Method of reasoning highly unworthy of our great Apostle! But indeed our Union with one another is not any Proof, and therefore could not be designed as a Proof, that we communicate of Christ’s Body, nor has it any Thing to do with the Apostle’s Argument. The single Point, which he had in View, was our Communion with God, by *eating those Things* which had been *offered to him*, viz. the *Body and Blood of Christ*. And this was in order to establish his main Point, that some Corinthian Christians, by *eating Things offered to Idols*, communicated with those *Idols*. But though our Union with each other is no Part of St. *Paul*’s Argument, yet the Mention of our Union with God suggesting it, he artfully throwed it in to anticipate his Reproof of their Divisions.

“ Thing ?

“ Thing? or that which is offered in Sacrifice to  
 “ Idols is any Thing? But I say, that the Things  
 “ which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice  
 “ [*dæmonious*] to Dæmons, and not to God; and  
 “ I would not that ye should have Fellowship  
 “ with Dæmons. Ye cannot drink the Cup of  
 “ the Lord and the Cup of Dæmons; ye cannot  
 “ be Partakers of the Lord’s Table and of the  
 “ Table of Dæmons. Do we provoke the Lord  
 “ to Jealousy? Are we stronger than He?”\*

The Apostle’s Reasoning evidently proceeds upon this Principle, that the three Feasts, Pagan, Jewish, and Christian, had one common Nature, and were expressive of a federal Engagement. As *Christians*, therefore, by the Acts of eating Bread and drinking Wine, the Representatives of *Christ’s Body and Blood*, professed themselves Disciples of a *crucified Saviour*, and partook of the Benefit of his Death — As *Jews*, by eating of the legal Sacrifices, declared themselves Children of the Mosaic Covenant, and communicated in the Blessing of the Altar upon which they were offered — So, in like manner, *Pagans*, by eating of an Idol’s Sacrifice, acknowledged themselves in League with him and depended on his Protection. Here the Apostle corrects himself. What say I then? that an Idol



is any Thing?<sup>a</sup> Do I by this Application allow that an Idol is morally, as to beneficial Influences, any Thing? or that what is offered in Sacrifice to Idols is, in this Sense, any Thing? By no Means. But I say, that the Sacrifices of the Heathens are offered to, I know not what, inferior Deities or Dæmons, and not to the true God; and I would not that ye should hold Communion with Dæmons. These Christians, with whom St. *Paul* is arguing, acted upon their old Pagan Principle of *Intercommunity*. They were, like the Athenians, [δεσποδαιμονεστειροι] attached to various Divinities.<sup>b</sup> This was agreeable enough to the Genius of Heathen Superstition, which allowed its Votaries in the Acknowledgment of “*many Gods and many Lords*. But “to us Christians there is but *one God and one Lord*.” The pure and undefiled Religion of *Jesus* reclaims us from the Errors of Paganism, excludes every *Idol-God*, banishes every *Idol-Lord*, and confines our Addresses to the *One God*,

<sup>a</sup> This Question is properly put by St. *Paul*, who had before denied that Idols were any Thing. Ch. VIII. 4. The Worshipers, however, imagined they were Something. Else why did they worship them? Indeed *Protection* is expressed in the very Name of a *tutelary* Deity. So that the Apostle's *Argument* must necessarily suppose an Idol to be Something, though He himself denies it to be any Thing.

<sup>b</sup> *Acts* XVII. 22.

through the powerful Intercession of the *One Mediator*. To partake, therefore, of an *Idol's* Feast, is renouncing at once our Christianity and the Benefits of it. "For what Concord hath *Christ* with *Belial*?" Indeed, says the Apostle, ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the Cup of Dæmons; ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table and of the Table of Dæmons. That is, ye cannot receive any *Benefit* from *Christ*,<sup>a</sup> if ye hope and expect to receive any from Dæmons. He is plainly speaking of an inward or spiritual Communion, for as to the outward, material Act, they communicated with Both. Nay they not only cut themselves off from all the Benefits of the Christian Sacrifice,

a If we observe the Apostle's Design in this Argument, says the Author of *the plain Account*, it will appear that he had not the least Occasion to speak here of the *Benefits* of *Christ's* Death. The Reason follows. St. *Paul's* Design was to incite the *Corinthians* to flee from Idolatry, by shewing them what a *Crime* it must be in a *Christian* to do (what was accounted) Honour to the Gods of the Heathens, by feasting upon, and partaking of their Sacrifices. In order to do this, it was not to his Purpose to say, By eating *Bread* and drinking *Wine* in the *Lord's-Supper* you partake of all the *Benefits* of *Christ's* Death, and therefore you cannot eat of the Heathen Sacrifices. Neither do I see that this is any Argument at all to the Point in his View. — Very true. And therefore he argues the direct contrary Way. You partake of Heathen Sacrifices, and therefore you cannot partake of the *Benefits* of *Christ's* Sacrifice. This, I say, is an Argument to his Purpose; and fully proves what he aimed at.

D

but

but likewise exposed themselves to the just Re-sentment of the supreme Being, who is "a jealous God, and will not give his Glory to another." Do we provoke the Lord to Jealousy? are we stronger than He? With these Questions the Apostle breaks off. Having laid down his Principles, he leaves the Conclusion to be drawn, with greater Advantage, by themselves. And indeed it is very obvious. He plainly refers them to the History of their Fathers, where they might read at once their Crime and their Punishment. And, without Contradiction, the same Crime, which devoted the Fathers to temporal Punishment, must necessarily subject the Children, sinning against clearer Light, and against greater Mercies, to a heavier Condemnation.

We have now discovered St. *Paul's* Notion of the *Lord's-Supper*, and have seen that it is founded on that universal Practice of *feasting upon Sacrifices*. Let us next proceed to examine the Gospel-history of the Institution.

It is observable, that our Saviour frequently took Occasion from accidental Occurrences to inculcate the saving Truths of his Religion, and called his Doctrine by the Name of the Image that offered itself. <sup>a</sup> Now the Time of the Insti-

<sup>a</sup> Thus when *Harvest* was approaching, he admonished his Disciples, more than once, of the *spiritual Harvest*. John IV. 35.  
Mat.



tution of the *Lord's-Supper* was the very Day of his Death, and likewise of the Paschal-Oblation, which, among all the legal Sacrifices, was the most striking Figure of it. The Thoughts of the Disciples were now intensely fixed on Both. *Jesus*, therefore, seizes the Opportunity, adopts the Jewish Phrase, and accommodates it, with great Propriety, to his own Institution. "When  
 "the Evening was come, he *sat down*, and the  
 "twelve Apostles with him. And he said unto  
 "them, I have earnestly desired to eat *this Pass-*  
 "*over* with you before I suffer." *This* Passover  
 — not the *Jewish*, for neither the *Time*, nor the  
*Posture*, of their eating was agreeable to that;  
 but the *Christian* Passover, the *representative Me-*  
*morial* of Himself, "the Lamb of God," who  
 was speedily to be offered up a *Sacrifice* and a  
*Ransom* for us all. — Having thus engaged their  
 Attention, "he took *Bread*, and gave Thanks,  
 "and blessed, and brake, and gave to his Dis-  
 "ciples, saying, Take, eat; This is my Body  
 "which is given and broken for you. Do this

Mat. IX. 37. Meeting a Man who had been *blind*, he talked of *spiritual Blindness*. John IX. 39. In the *Temple* he spake of the *Temple of his Body*. John II. 19. Discouraging at *Jacob's Well* with the Woman of *Samaria*, he mentioned *living Water*. John IV. 6—14. ——— St. Paul styles *Baptism* the *Circumcision of Christ*. Col. II. 11.

“for a Memorial of Me. For I say unto you,  
 “I will not any more eat thereof, until it be  
 “fulfilled in the Kingdom of God.<sup>a</sup> Likewise  
 “also the Cup after Supper; that is, after they  
 “had eaten the Bread, the *Christian Passover*, he  
 “took the Cup, and gave Thanks and blessed,  
 “and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it.  
 “And they all drank of it. And he said, This  
 “is my Blood of the new Testament, which is  
 “shed for you and for many for the Remission  
 “of Sins. Do this for a Memorial of Me. Ve-  
 “rily I say unto you, I will drink no more of  
 “this Fruit of the Vine, until that Day when I

a This is evidently the true Connection, as appears by comparing the Evangelists together. *Matthew* and *Mark* agree in saying, that our Saviour would drink no more of the Sacramental Cup, till he drank it after a new Manner in Heaven. *Luke* therefore must necessarily speak of the *same* Cup, when he adds the same characteristic Circumstance. And as the three Evangelists agree in their Application of this Circumstance to the *Cup*, we may reasonably conclude, that *Luke* is speaking of the *Bread* in the Lord's-Supper, when he introduces our Saviour applying the very *same* Circumstance to what he calls the *Passover*. — In Ver. 17 and 20 the Evangelist is not speaking of *two* distinct Cups, but of *one* and the *same*. He first gives an Account of the Institution, and then explains the Design of it. Agreeably to *Mark*, who expressly says, that the Apostles drank of the Cup before our Saviour told them what it was. And we may reasonably suppose the *same* of the Bread. The *Bread* therefore in the 19th Verse is the *same* with what is called the *Passover* in the 15th.

“ shall

“shall drink it new with you in my Father’s  
“Kingdom. And they sung an Hymn.”<sup>a</sup>

This is the whole of what the sacred Writers have recorded concerning the Institution of the *Lord’s-Supper*. And it is obvious to remark, that the *Jewish* Passover was the Model of the *Christian*. The same Notion therefore, which a *Jew* would entertain of his Passover, *Christians* must now entertain of their Passover — the *Lord’s-Supper*. But the *Jewish* Passover was a *Feast upon a Sacrifice*. And therefore the *Christian* Passover must be so too.

But we are not left to collect this Notion of the *Lord’s-Supper* from its declared Analogy to the Jewish Passover, which, however, is alone sufficient to establish it. — Our blessed Lord has himself expressly asserted it. In the old Passover the very *Lamb*, that was offered, was *eaten* by the Worshippers. This could not be done in the new. The *Lamb of God*, the holy Child *Jesus*, could not give us his *Flesh to eat*. Some Representatives therefore must be appointed. These are *Bread* and *Wine*. But these he emphatically styles his *Body* and *Blood*, one of which was *broken*, and the other *shed, for the Remission*

<sup>a</sup> *Mat.* XXVI. 26—30. *Mark* XIV. 22—26. *Luke* XXII. 14—20. *1 Cor.* XI. 23—26 compared. \*



*of our Sins.* The *Lord's-Supper*, therefore, is a *Feast upon the Body and Blood of Christ*. Or, in other Words, it is a *Feast upon a Sacrifice*.

Having learned the general Nature of the *Lord's-Supper*, we will endeavour to find out the Meaning of the particular Phrases, which occur in the History of the Institution.

The first is the *Name*, by which the *Bread* in this holy Supper is called, borrowed from a celebrated Feast among the Jews. As I have already taken Notice of this Circumstance, I shall only add, that Christ is expressly styled, by *St. Paul*, “our *Passover* that is *sacrificed* for “us.”<sup>a</sup> And our Church acknowledges him under the same Character, as “the very *Paschal-Lamb* which was *offered* for us, and hath taken away the Sin of the World.” And consequently, the *Lord's-Supper* must bear the same Relation to the *Paschal-Feast*, as his *Death* did to the *Paschal-Sacrifice*.

Our next Inquiry is, what we are to understand by the Term *Blessing*. He took Bread and *blessed*. Does the Word relate to *God* only, under the Notion of *Thanksgiving*? or to the *Bread* only, under the Notion of *Consecration*? or to *both*? Now, not to trouble you with Distinctions, without any Difference, between the

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. V. 7.

Words made Use of by the several Evangelists, nor with Variations in Manuscripts, it will be sufficient to observe, for our Satisfaction in this Point, that St. Paul, speaking of the *Cup*, expressly calls it “the Cup of *Thanksgiving* [*ο ευλο- γεμεν*] *which we bless*,” or set apart for this sacred Purpose. This is the one natural and obvious Meaning of the Original. To render it, as some do, the Cup of *Thanksgiving*, *over* which we give *Thanks* to God, is putting a Sense upon the Words, of which they are hardly capable. It is manifestly perverting the Apostle’s Design, instead of explaining it, and it is introducing a Repetition and Sameness of Expression, for which we cannot see a Reason. And as nothing was conveyed to the *Wine*, which was not to the *Bread*, we may reasonably conclude, that what is applied, by the Apostle, to the one, is equally applicable to the other. So that this seems to be the full Meaning of the Phrase. “Our Saviour, having taken *Bread* and *Wine*, “gave *Thanks* to God for his inestimable Love to “Mankind in sending *Him* into the World to “suffer Death upon the Cross for their Redemption, “and blessed them, separated and set them apart, “from the common Purposes of Food, to be, on “this solemn Occasion, the Representatives and “Proxies of his *Body* and *Blood*.”—Not that the  
Elements

Elements of *Bread* and *Wine*, even after Consecration, acquire any real Holiness, (this is indeed a groundless Notion) but they are sanctified, or made *holy*, merely by Institution. Thus the *Shew Bread*, under the Law, was esteemed *holy*, in Opposition to *common*.<sup>a</sup> So likewise the *seventh Day* is *holy*, being set apart, from the *common* Purposes of our Time, for the more immediate Service of Almighty God.<sup>b</sup> And, in the same Sense, the *Ground*, where God conversed with *Moses*, is called, from the Occasion, *holy Ground*.<sup>c</sup>

Another Expression deserving Notice is that famous one, "*This is my Body* which is *broken* for *you*." Strange Senses have been put upon these Words. But the true one is obvious. The *Lord's-Supper* is a *Type*, and, as such, a *Representation*, by *Action* instead of *Words*, of *Christ crucified*. That is, the *Actions* of *breaking Bread* and *pouring out Wine* are *significative* of *Christ's Body broken*, and of his *Blood poured out*. Just as *raising the dry Bones to Life* was a *Type*, a visible Representation, of the Redemption from *Babylon*, and the *Actions* in the Paschal Feast a *Type* of the Redemption from *Egypt*. And what is particularly remarkable to our present Purpose, in the first Instance God expressly says to *Eze-*

<sup>a</sup> 1 Sam. XXI. 4.

<sup>b</sup> Exod. XX. 8.

<sup>c</sup> Exod. III. 5.  
kiel,



kiel, "*These Bones are the whole House of Israel,*" and in the second to *Moses*, "*This is the Lord's Passover.*" So, in the Passage before us, *Jesus* says to the Twelve, "*This is my Body* which is "*broken* for you." Not simply, *This Bread is my Body*, for the Original will not naturally and grammatically bear that Sense, but, this whole Service, this complex *Action* of *breaking* and *eating* Bread is or *represents* my Body which is *broken* for you. The *Bread* is no more the real *Body* of *Christ*, than the four Letters which compose that *Word* are his *Body*. So again, with Regard to the *Cup*, "*This is my Blood* of the "*New Testament.*" That is, this *Action* of *drinking* Wine is, or, *represents*, my Blood, which is *shed* for the Confirmation of the New Testament. It is plain he had in View the Words of *Moses*. "*This is the Blood of the Testament* "*which God hath enjoined to you.*" However, the Blood of *Jesus* is not merely the *Seal* of the New Testament, in which Forgiveness of Sins is freely offered to every true penitent — it is likewise the *Cause* of that Forgiveness, the *Means* of our Reconciliation with God. It was *shed*, as he himself assures us, *for the Remission of Sins*. Manifold are the Proofs, which concur to establish this important Truth. But I cannot enlarge upon them in this Place. Only let me

E

add,

add, to ascertain the Scripture Notion of *Redemption*, that our blessed Saviour laid down his Life for us, in the same Sense as a Man lays down his Life for his Friend; or, to borrow his own most beautiful and expressive Image, as the *good Shepherd layeth down his Life for the Sheep.*<sup>a</sup> — Our Saviour's *Death*, therefore, is at once the *Means* of our Pardon, and the *Seal* of it.

Nor does this Redemption by *Christ* derogate, in the least, from the Mercies of God. It was indeed the Effect of them. *The Christian Scheme is founded in the Benevolence of the Deity.* “Glo-  
 “ ry be to God in the highest, FOR there is  
 “ *Peace on Earth*, (so it should be translated)  
 “ *Good-will towards Men.*”<sup>b</sup> And again, “So  
 “ God loved the World, that *he gave* his only  
 “ begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him  
 “ should not perish, but have everlasting Life.”<sup>c</sup>  
 And to mention but one Passage more, “God  
 “ being *rich in Mercy*, for his great Love where-  
 “ with he loved us, even when we were dead in  
 “ Sins, hath quickened us together with Christ,  
 “ that he might shew *the exceeding Riches of his*  
 “ *Grace in his Kindness towards us through Christ*  
 “ *Jesus.*”<sup>d</sup> This is the uniform Language of the

a *John* X. 11.

b *Luke* II. 14.

c *John* III. 16.

d *Eph.* II. 4—7.

sacred Writers. They, every where, represent the God and Father of Mercies surveying, with the most tender Pity and Compassion, a wretched Set of Creatures lost and hopeless. “He *looked*, say they, but there was *none to help*; “and he *wondered* that there was *no Intercessor*. “— *Therefore his own Arm brought Salvation.*”

And here we cannot but remark a material Difference between the Old Testament and the *New*. The Benefits of the former were confined to a particular Nation, being appropriated to the Inhabitants of *Jerusalem* and the Men of *Judah*, *one Part* of the Posterity of *Abraham*. Those of the latter are equally applicable to the *whole Race of Adam*. They were freely offered to the first Man, and shall be graciously dispensed to the last. “This is *my Blood* which is *shed* “*for you* and *for many*,” that is, for *all*, as the Word frequently signifies.<sup>a</sup> Agreeably to other Parts of Scripture where we are told, that “Christ gave himself a Ransom for all.”<sup>b</sup> And again, “He is the Saviour of *all Men*.”<sup>c</sup>—The Influence of the *Sun of Righteousness*, like that

a Not to multiply Instances in so plain a Case, it will be sufficient to set down one Passage in the Epistle to the *Romans*. IV. 16. 17. — *Abraham*, who is the Father of us *all*. As it is written, I have made thee a Father of *many Nations*.

b 1 *Tim.* II. 6.

c 1 *Tim.* IV. 10.



of the material Sun, extendeth itself throughout all the Works of God, and Nothing, that is capable of receiving it, shall be hid from the Heat thereof.

It is worth noticing, that our Saviour says, "This is my Body which *is broken* — This is my Blood which *is shed*, for you." This affords us an Answer to a very trifling Objection, urged by some with an Air of great Importance, to the Notion I have been endeavouring to establish. For say they, with more Subtilty than Reason, as the *Lord's-Supper* was instituted *before* Jesus was sacrificed, it cannot be a Feast upon or *after* the Sacrifice.

To this we reply, that in whatever Light we consider the *Lord's-Supper*, whether as a *bare Memorial* of a *departed Friend*, (like some celebrated Heathen Feasts, instituted by the Schools of Philosophy, to preserve the Memory of their respective Founders) or, in a higher and nobler View, as a *Feast upon the Sacrifice of his Body and Blood*, it must necessarily be considered as relative to an Act that is *past*. And therefore when our Saviour said, "This is my Body which *is broken* — This is my Blood which *is shed*," he plainly *anticipated* the Time of his Sufferings, and spake of himself as already offered. Thus, when God enjoined the Ob-  
servation

servation of the Jewish Passover, he said, "For  
 "in the self same Day *have I brought you out of*  
 "the Land of *Egypt* " — though they were still  
 "there. Nay, they even *ate* the Passover in To-  
 "ken of their *Deliverance* out of *Egypt*, at the  
 "very Time when they were *Slaves* and *Bond-*  
 "*men* in it."

Let me observe, in passing, that when *Christ*  
 said, "This is my Blood of the *New Testament*,"  
 he declared the Abolition of animal Sacrifices,  
 and put an End to the Jewish Dispensation.  
 For, to borrow *St. Paul's* Argument, "in that  
 "he says, a *New Testament*, he maketh the  
 "first *Old*. Now that which decayeth and wax-  
 "eth old is ready to *vanish away*." <sup>b</sup>

To proceed — "Do this for a Memorial of  
 "Me." In this, as in every other Instance of  
 Christian Obedience, God hath closely linked  
 our Interest with our Duty. What our Saviour  
 says of the *Sabbath* is equally true of all the Or-  
 dinances of Religion. *They were made for Man*  
 — for his *Benefit* as well as for his *Use*. "Do  
 "*this*." — It is a *Paschal* Phrase. "All the Con-  
 "gregation of *Israel* shall *do it*;" <sup>c</sup> that is, shall  
*do this Service*, shall *keep this Feast*, as it is ex-  
 pressed in other Places. "*Do this*" then, is as  
 much as to say, Take Bread, give Thanks, bless,

<sup>a</sup> *Exod.* XII. 17.

<sup>b</sup> *Heb.* VIII. 13.

<sup>c</sup> *Exod.* XII. 47.  
 break,

break, and eat; or Do this Service, Keep this Feast. So St. *Paul* says, "*Christ* our Passover is "sacrificed for us, therefore let us *keep the Feast*." <sup>a</sup> Then follows the End of this divine Service: "Do this [*εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*] (not in *Remembrance of Me*, as our Translators have unwarily rendered it, and have thereby given Occasion to some, who desired Occasion, of degrading this respectable Institution, and of confining the Notion of it to a bare *Remembrance* of an absent Friend, but) *for a Memorial of Me*;" that is, according to the strict Propriety of the sacred Phrase, that *God, for my Sake, may remember you*. When God made a Covenant with *Noah*, and appointed the *Rain-Bow* for the Token of it, he told him, "The *Bow* shall be *seen* "in the Cloud, and I will *remember* my Covenant." And again, "The *Bow* shall be in the "Cloud, and *I will look upon it, that I may remember* the everlasting Covenant." <sup>b</sup> Here the *Bow* is expressly said to appear, that God may *remember* his Covenant. Not that it is possible for God to *forget* his Covenant, even without these Signs and Tokens. But in all his Dealings with us he lets himself down, with the greatest Condescension, to our Infirmities, and as it were, cloaths himself with our Weaknesses. So like-

a 1 Cor. V. 7.

b Gen. IX. 15. 16.



wife the *Blood* of the *Paschal Lamb*, sprinkled upon the Houses of the *Hebrews*, was for a "*Token* where they were. And when I see the "*Blood*, says God, I will pass over you, when "*I smite the Land of Egypt.*"<sup>a</sup> And in the next Verse the Paschal Solemnity is expressly styled a *Memorial*. "*This Day shall be unto you for a Memorial — a Memorial before God,*" as the following Words testify, and ye shall "*keep it a Feast unto the Lord.*" Indeed every Part of the *Temple Service* was, in this Sense, a *Memorial* — a *Memorial* before God as well as the *People*. † It is needless to multiply Instances

a *Exod.* XII. 13.

† I desire the Reader to consider the following Passages. — Stones of *Memorial* unto the Children of Israel. And Aaron shall bear their Names *before the Lord for a Memorial* — for a *Memorial* before the Lord continually. *Exod.* XXVIII. 12. 29. The Atonement-money — that it may be a *Memorial* unto the Children of Israel *before the Lord*. XXX. 16. The Priest shall burn the *Memorial* of it upon the Altar. *Lev.* II. 2. 9. 16. V. 12. VI. 15. That the Frankincense may be on the Bread *for a Memorial* (εὐαμνησιν) XXIV. 7. They brought the Gold into the Tabernacle, a *Memorial* for the Children of Israel *before the Lord*. *Num.* XXXI. 54. He that maketh a *Memorial* of Incense, as if he blessed an Idol. *Is.* LXVI. 3. Give a *Memorial* of fine Flower. *Eccclus.* XXXVIII. 11. N.B. The *Memorial* of any Thing, is a *Hebrew* Idiom, and means, that such a Thing is *for a Memorial*, the Means of bringing to Remembrance, as it is explained *Num.* V. 15. Thus *Lev.* XXIII. 24. we meet with a *Memorial* of blowing with Trumpets. Surely! the *Trumpets* are not the Objects, as the *English* Expression sounds, but the Means of Remembrance.

in so known a Case. I will mention one for all the rest, as I find it in the elegant Composition of the *Son of Sirach*. “He chose *Aaron* out of  
 “all Men living to offer Sacrifices to the Lord,  
 “Incense, and a sweet Savour, *for a Memorial,*

*brance*. And so God himself explains it. When ye go to War, ye shall *blow an Alarm* with the *Trumpets*, and ye shall be *remembered before your God*. Num. X. 9. And again, Also in the Days of your Gladness, and in your solemn Days, and in the Beginning of your Months, ye shall *blow with the Trumpets* over your burnt Offerings, and over your Peace-Offerings, that they may be to You for a *Memorial* (*αναμνησις*) before your God. 10. And the Angel says to *Tobit*, When thou didst pray, I brought the *Remembrance of thy Prayers before the Holy One*. XII. 12. i. e. in plain English, I brought thy Prayer *for a Remembrance of Thee* before the Holy One. Another Instance will be decisive. *The Sacrifice* of a just Man is acceptable, and *the Memorial thereof* (*μνηστωσαν αωτης*) shall never be forgotten. *Ecclus.* XXXV. 7. Here the Phrase, *the Memorial of the Sacrifice*, is used in the Sense of *the Law*, and signifies, *the Sacrifice for a Memorial, the Means of putting God in Remembrance of the Worshipper*. In the same Sense *Cornelius's* Alms and Prayers ascended *for a Memorial, were had in Remembrance*, in the Sight of God. *Acts* X. 4. 31. i. e. they were *the Means of putting God in Remembrance of him*. — So it is in the *Lord's-Supper*. We do the prescribed *Actions* for a *Remembrance* or *Memorial* of *Christ crucified*; i. e. we *offer Christ for a Remembrance* or *Memorial of Us* before the Father. And here let no overzealous Objector first mistake my Meaning, and then charge me with introducing *Po-pery*. The Term *Offering*, when rightly understood, hath a very innocent Import. And my Intention, from what has been already said, is, I think, clear and obvious. In short, by *offering Christ*, I only mean, *representing* before the Father, by *significative Actions*, the *Death* of his Son. Instead of *telling in Words*,  
 we

“to make Reconciliation for his People.”<sup>a</sup> In the same Sense, the *Lord's-Supper* is a *Memorial*, a *Token to put God in Remembrance of us*. CHRIST is not the OBJECT, but the MEANS of REMEMBRANCE. “Whatsoever ye shall *ask the Father in MY NAME*,

we tell, by *Actions*, the full, perfect, and sufficient *Sacrifice*, *Oblation*, and *Satisfaction*, which *Christ* made, by his own Oblation of Himself *Once* offered upon the Cross, for the Sins of the whole World. And, agreeable to this Notion of the Rite, I find in the first Liturgy of King *Edward VI.* (and in the *Scotch Form*) this *Memorial*, or Prayer of Oblation, which *Bucer*, in a *Rage* of Reformation, prevailed to have ejected. “Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the Institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble Servants do celebrate, and make here, before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy Gifts, the *Memorial* which thy Son hath willed us to make; having in Remembrance his blessed Passion,” &c. The Interpretation here offered, so far from being justly chargeable with the shocking Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, is really subversive of it. And if our Liturgy should be ever again publicly reviewed, (which is much to be wished) it is humbly hoped that this *Memorial*, so essential to the Service, may be replaced in its antient Station. — The celebrated Author of the *plain Account*, not attending to this Notion of the original Phrase, but resting entirely on the bare Sound of the *English*, has writ a great Deal, in his Way, about the *Memorial* or *Remembrance* of Christ, which, to speak very favourably, is just nothing to the Purpose.

“As to the *Plain Account*, I heard *Whiston* say, that he told the *Queen*, that the *Bishop* did not understand the Nature of the *Sacrament* so well Now, as when sixteen Years old.” *Middleton's* 3d Letter to *Warburton*.

<sup>a</sup> *Ecclus.* XLV. 16.

F

“says



“says the Saviour of the World, he will give it  
 “you. Hitherto have ye asked Nothing in  
 “MY NAME; ask and ye shall receive.”<sup>a</sup>  
 Now *eating Bread* and *drinking Wine* in the  
*Name of Christ*, is *praying to God* by *Actions*  
 instead of *Words*. It is, in the Language of  
 St. Paul, *shewing forth the Death of Christ*, ex-  
 pressing our *Faith in his Blood*, and pleading  
 the Merits of it before the Throne of Grace.  
 In short, it is humbly beseeching God, that,  
 for the Sake of our *crucified Redeemer*, he  
 would *remember us for Good*; or, in the affect-  
 ing Language of the sacred Psalmist — RE-  
 MEMBER us, O LORD, *with the Favour*  
*that thou bearest unto thy People* — O visit us with  
 thy SALVATION.

Our Saviour adds, “I will no more eat there-  
 “of, until it be *fulfilled* in the Kingdom of God  
 “— I will not drink of the Fruit of the Vine,  
 “until I drink it *new* with you in my Father’s  
 “Kingdom.” Here the Happiness of Heaven  
 is, in a familiar Manner, represented under the  
 Image of a *Feast*. But lest the Disciples should  
 vainly flatter themselves with the Thoughts of a  
*temporal* Kingdom and a *carnal* Banquet, he  
 expresses himself in such a Way as must obviate  
 all Mistakes — until it be *fulfilled* — until I drink

<sup>a</sup> John XVI. 23. 24.

it *new* with you. His Meaning is, They should not celebrate this Feast together again till they met in Heaven, where they should feast *really* and *truly*, as they now did *sacramentally* and *typically*, on the Fruits of his *Passion*. — And blessed are They which shall be called to the Marriage-Supper of the Lamb !

*Christ* concluded his Paschal Solemnity, as the Jews were wont to conclude theirs, with a *Hymn*. What Portion of sacred Writ, and, no Doubt, some Portion of sacred Writ, was rehearsed on this Occasion, we cannot determine with any Certainty. Very probable it is, that, as the Christian Passover was formed upon the Jewish Plan, some choice Passages might be selected out of the *Song of Moses*. You will bear with me while I recite to You the most striking Parts of this fine and animated Composition — “ I  
 “ will sing unto the *Lord*, for He hath triumph-  
 “ ed gloriously. The *Lord* is my Strength and  
 “ my Song, and he is become my *Salvation*.  
 “ Thy right Hand, O *Lord*, is become glorious  
 “ in Power ; thy right Hand, O *Lord*, hath  
 “ dashed in Pieces the Enemy ; and in the  
 “ Greatness of thine Excellency thou hast over-  
 “ thrown them that rose up against thee. Who  
 “ is like unto Thee, O *Lord*, Who is like unto  
 “ Thee, glorious in Holiness, fearful in Praises,  
 F 2 “ doing

“doing Wonders! Thou in thy Mercy hast  
 “led forth the People which Thou hast *redeem-*  
 “*ed*; Thou hast guided them in thy Strength to  
 “*thy holy Habitation*. Fear and Dread shall fall  
 “upon thine Enemies; by the Greatness of thine  
 “Arm they shall be as still as a Stone; till thy  
 “People pass over, O *Lord*, till the People pass  
 “over which Thou hast *purchased*. *Thou shalt*  
 “*bring them in, and plant them in the Mountain*  
 “*of thine Inheritance, in the Place, O Lord,*  
 “*which Thou hast made for Thee to dwell in*; in the  
 “Sanctuary, O *Lord*, which thy Hands have  
 “established. — *The Lord shall reign for ever*  
 “*and ever*. — Sing ye to the *Lord*, for He  
 “hath *triumphed gloriously*.”

These Parts of the Hymn being so applicable  
 to the Christian Feast, I cannot but think that  
 they were used by *Jesus* and the Twelve. And  
 I am the more confirmed in this Opinion from  
 a Passage in the *Revelations*, where the *Redeem-*  
*ed of the Lord* are represented, in St. *John's* Vi-  
 sion of the Church in Heaven, “singing the Song  
 “of *Moses* and of the *Lamb*.”<sup>a</sup>

Having discovered the true Notion of the  
*Lord's-Supper*, and explained the Meaning of  
 the most remarkable Phrases, which we find in  
 the History of the Institution, Nothing now re-



mains, but to explain the Qualifications of Those who would reap any Benefit from this sacred Feast; and to press you to a Constant Celebration of it.

The Nature of this Feast is of itself sufficient to assure us, that it ought to be a constant Part of Divine Worship. *Sacrifice*, we know, was always among all Nations, *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*, the external Rite of Supplication, the standing Means of addressing themselves to their respective Deities. Now the Sacrifice of *Christ* succeeded into the Place of *animal* Sacrifices. The *Lord's-Supper* therefore, which is a Representation of his Sacrifice, is the standing external Rite of Prayer and Supplication in the Christian Church. And what we thus argue from the Nature of the Christian Feast, is abundantly confirmed to us in the sacred Records of our Religion. In the first and purest Ages of the Gospel, as the Scripture expressly assure us, the End, for which Christians met together *on the first Day of the Week*, was to *break Bread*.<sup>a</sup> On this *stated Day*, as a Heathen Writer reports, the Christians assembled before Day-light, to sing a Song of Thanksgiving to *Christ* as a God, and to bind themselves by a *Sacrament* not to do any Kind of Wickedness. Which done, they

<sup>a</sup> *Acts* XX. 7.

departed.

departed, and *met together* again to *partake in common* of an innocent *Meal*. And it is remarkable, that those Words in the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, — When ye come together into one Place *this is not to eat the Lord's-Supper* — are thus paraphrased in a very antient Translation \* — Ye do not eat and drink as becomes the *Day of our Lord* — Which plainly shews, that partaking of the *Lord's-Supper* was, in those Times, the proper Duty of the *Lord's Day*.

How some among us can allow themselves in a constant Neglect of this important Duty, I know not. Such Persons, it is plain, have no Regard to the last Injunction of their dying Saviour, when he commands them to *Do this*; nor to their own true Interest, when he commands the *doing it* for *God's Remembrance of them*. *Do this* — is as positive and express a Command, as any to be met with throughout the whole Scripture. And the *Doing it* is the appointed Means of drawing down upon them the Blessings of Heaven. But, perhaps, they have wrong Notions of it — have entertained groundless Conceits of, I know not what, preparatory Purifications, picked up from some well-meaning but mistaken Writers, who have prescribed a Multiplicity of little, unedifying

\* Syriac.

Requisites, and have thereby spread a Gloom over this most comfortable Sacrament, and have turned the Cup of *Thanksgiving* into a Cup of *Trembling*. Far be it from Me to widen the narrow Gate, or to loosen the Bands of the Gospel. But to reduce them to the contracted Limits of some modern Systems, will render the one impassable, and the other intolerable. And Nothing, I am persuaded, has more contributed to bring this sacred Ordinance into Disuse and Contempt, than superstitious Notions of it. True indeed it is, and must not be denied, that He that eateth and drinketh *unworthily*, eateth and drinketh his own *Condemnation*. *That*, which was intended to be a *Savour of Life unto Life*, will be to that Man a *Savour of Death unto Death*. But then we likewise know, that the *Sacrifice* of the Wicked is an *Abomination* to the Lord, and their very *Prayers are turned into Sin*. What must they do then? Must they forsake the assembling themselves together, as the Manner of some is? Nay — But let the *wicked* rather *forsake* his *Ways*, and the unrighteous Man his *Thoughts*, and let him *return* unto the *Lord*, for he will have Mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. And the Rule is the same with Regard to the *Lord's-Supper*. St. Paul does not advise the uncharitable



charitable *Corinthians* to keep away from this sacred Feast, but to come to the Celebration of it in a proper Manner. Let every Man *examine* and *approve himself*, and SO let him eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup. Our Church has determined the Case in the same Manner. “ If  
 “ any Man say, I am a grievous *Sinner*, and  
 “ therefore am *afraid to come*; wherefore then  
 “ do ye not *repent* and *amend*? When God calleth  
 “ you, are ye not ashamed to say, You will not  
 “ come? When ye should return to God, will  
 “ ye excuse yourselves, and say, ye are not ready? And the Invitation is addressed to Such  
 as, truly and earnestly repenting them of their Sins, *intend* to lead a new Life. However, let us be cautious not to run into the opposite Extreme. As God insists upon our *communicating*, so he insists upon our communicating *well* too. I mean — with such good Dispositions as will fit frail and imperfect Creatures to appear in the Presence of their Maker. — And the good God pardon every one that prepareth his Heart to seek the Lord in this Holy Feast, though he be not purified according to the Purification of the Sanctuary !

The Qualifications requisite to render this, and indeed every other, religious Act and Office available for Acceptance in the Sight of God,  
 are,

are, I conceive, these Three — Repentance — Faith — Charity.

To be sorry for our Offences, is the first Step toward Amendment. *Repentance*, therefore, is the indispensable Duty of every Sinner. But Sorrow for Sin is not the Whole of Repentance. It must be compleated and perfected by the most sincere Intentions of Amendment, and the most unfeigned Resolutions of Obedience.

Nor is this all. Repentance, though necessary, is not of itself sufficient, to Salvation. The Reason is obvious. Because a future Obedience would still have been due from us, if we had never offended. How then can *That*, which is but the *Duty* of a *Saint*, make *Atonement* for a *Sinner*? The Law of Nature enjoins a perfect and unfinning Obedience, without any healing Clauses in Case of Disobedience. Supposing no Disease, it prescribes no Remedy. Allowing for no Transgression, it provides no Pardon. This is the unspeakable *Gift* of God *through Christ*. The Religion of *Jesus* supposeth us to be *Sinners*, and treateth us as such. In his wounded Side a Fountain was opened for Sin and for Uncleaness. Repentance therefore must be an essential Part of his Religion. The Merit of his Sufferings stamps a Value upon Repentance, and maketh it available unto Life.

G

Hence

Hence *Faith in Christ* becomes another indispensable Article in the Religion of a Sinner. Accordingly St. Paul, in opening the Divine Counsel, testifies both to Jews and Greeks, Repentance towards God, and *Faith* towards our Lord *Jesus Christ*. Now by *Faith* we are not to understand barely a Belief in the *Prophetic Character* of the Blessed *Jesus* — (a *Mahometan* will believe this) — nor yet a Belief in his *Priesthood*, if we consider him only as a *Creature*; but Faith likewise in his *Divinity*. THAT alone gave *Virtue* and *Energy* to the *Blood of the Cross*. And therefore That Faith alone will be imputed to us for Righteousness.

But though Faith begins in the Understanding, it must not end there. The Faith required by the Gospel (whatever *Enthusiasts* may vainly dream) is not a barren, speculative Principle, but operative and practical, purifying the Heart, and benevolently exerting itself in all the various Charities of Beneficence.

*Charity* therefore is the finishing Article in the Religion of a Sinner, the End of the Commandment, and the very Bond of Perfectness. “*Father, forgive us our Trespases, as we forgive Them that trespass against us*” — is not less the Voice of Reason than of Authority; and Nature herself would have taught us this Duty, if the Gospel



Gospel had not enjoined it. *One Man*, says the *Son of Sirach*, beareth Hatred against another, and doth He seek Pardon of the Lord? He sheweth no Mercy to a Man that is like himself, and doth He ask Forgiveness of his own Sins? Such a Behaviour is highly inconsistent with the Rules of common Justice. And therefore he very suitably giveth this Admonition. *Forgive thy Neighbour the Hurt that he hath done to thee, so shall thy Sins also be forgiven thee when thou prayest.* — If this was the Sentiment of a Jew, how should the same Principle influence the Addressees of a *Christian*! — at that Season more especially, when he is, in a particular Manner, calling to Mind the exceeding great Love of his dying Saviour, and representing it before his Father which is in Heaven. On this Occasion, surely, if on any, we should put on Bowels of Compassion, and forgive one another, even as God, for Christ's Sake, hath forgiven us. For if, in our common Intercourses with each other, he that hateth his Brother is a Murderer; in this most solemn Act of our Religion the Colour of the Offence will be infinitely heightened, and the uncharitable Communicant will be justly ranked among those leading Murderers — the Crucifiers of the Lord of Life.

And that this is really no Aggravation, but a just State of the Case, will appear, if we consider that celebrated Passage of *St. Paul*, where he treateth of eating and drinking *unworthily* in this sacred Feast. For though it is commonly supposed, that the Crime of the *Corinthians* was a Want of *Sobriety*, yet, upon a closer View, we shall discover it to have been a Want of *Charity*.

The Apostle introduceth his Discourse with a becoming Censure of their *Animosities* and *Divisions*. “In this that I declare unto you, I praise  
“you not, that ye come together not for the  
“better, but for the worse. For first of all,  
“when ye *come together in the Church*, I hear  
“that there be *Divisions* among you; — (their  
“*Divisions*, you hear, are the Subject of his  
“Censure) — and I believe it of Some of you.  
“For there must be even *Heresies* among you,  
“that they which are tried and approved may  
“be made manifest among you. *Your coming*  
“*together* therefore into one Place, is not to eat  
“the *Lord's-Supper*. For when *You* eat, every  
“one *seizes, greedily, his own Supper*.” They  
met together, professedly, to eat the *Lord's-Supper*, and yet ate a Supper of a very different Na-

a Græce habetur *ἁδιακόσμως*, quo verbo significatur, *tumultuante* admodum, & nullo prorsus ordine omnia illic gesta. *Hypocritis* in locum,

ture,

ture. The *Lord's-Supper* is a *Feast* of *Charity*, and therefore inconsistent with their *Animosities*. It is a *social* Feast, the *joint Act* of the several Members of the same Body, and therefore inconsistent with their splitting into *Parties*, and eating separately by themselves. The Consequence of this their Conduct was such as might naturally be expected. One *feasted* while another *wanted*. The rich, who brought much, ate their Bread to the full; and the poor, who could bring nothing, lacked. In *your Assemblies*, says the Apostle, "one is *hungry*, and another — (not *drunken*, in the gross Sense of the Term, but) — *full*." It stands in Opposition to *Hunger* or *Want*, and must therefore signify *Fullness* or *Abundance*. The Word has the same innocent Meaning in other Places. When *Joseph* entertained his Brethren, we are told, that they drank and *were merry* (εμεθυσθησαν) with him. And in *Jeremiah* God says, (μεθυσω) I will *sate* the Souls of the Priests. And again, I have *satiated* the weary Soul. And in *St. John*, the Governour of the Feast says to the Bridegroom, every Man at the Beginning doth set forth good Wine, and when Men have well drunk (μεθυσθωσι,) then that which is worse. In all these Places, as well as in the Passage before us, the Word has a very innocent Meaning.

So



So that the Intemperance of the *Corinthians*, here censured by the Apostle, was merely relative, and respected only the Occasion of their Meeting, which was to eat the *Lord's-Supper*. Instead of eating, as became the Sacredness of the Entertainment, *sparingly*, and for the Spiritual Purposes of Religion, they feasted *liberally*, after their old Pagan Fashion, to the satisfying of the Flesh. And instead of distributing to the Necessities of those who could provide Nothing for themselves, they even insulted their Poverty, and put them to open Shame. "What! (says the Apostle, with the warmest Indignation) "hath ye not Houses to eat and to drink in? " (that is, for the common Purposes of Life) or "despise ye the (poor Part of the) Church of "God, and shame them that have not?" This Expostulation clearly sheweth the Nature of their Intemperance, and proveth it to have been such only as was unbecoming the *House of God*. For had it been a Breach of the moral Law, it would have been, though less criminal, yet absolutely intolerable even in *their own*. "What "shall I say to you? (as the Apostle goeth on) "shall I praise you? In this I praise you not." To give a Check therefore to this Spirit of Intemperance, and to heal their Breaches, he lays before them an Account of the Institution, the  
very

very same as he had personally delivered to them before. Now from this Account it plainly appears, that the *Materials* of this *Feast*, though, sensibly, *Bread* and *Wine*, are, spiritually, the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; and therefore they are to be eaten as *such*, and not as *common* Food. And since *Christ*, who died for all his Disciples, distributed the Bread of Life equally to all, it is the Duty of the Church to follow his Example. Where the Master of the Feast has made no Difference, the Guests should make none. He then proceedeth, very naturally, to lay before them the great Danger of eating and drinking *unworthily*. “Wherefore whosoever shall eat *this* “*Bread* and drink the *Cup* of the Lord *unworthily* shall be guilty of the *Body* and *Blood* of “*the Lord*.” Now the *Corinthians* by their *uncharitable* Carriage to their poor Bretheren had been eminently guilty in this Respect. The Reason is this. We are in general the *Body* of *Christ*, and *Members* in particular. Consequently an Offence against particular *Members* is an Offence against the *Head* of the Body of which they are Members. This is our Apostle’s Determination of the Case upon another Occasion. “When ye sin against the *Brethren*, ye sin against *Christ*.” The Relation aggravates the Offence. And our Master himself has likewise assured

assured us, that in the last Day, he will look upon all our Actions, whether good or evil, which we have done to each other, as done to Himself. “Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as “ye did it unto one of the *least* of these my Bre-  
 “*thren*, ye have done it unto *Me*.” And from this Danger St. *Paul* exhorts the *Corinthians* to search their own Hearts and Tempers, and to make the Institution the Rule of their Examination. “But let every Man *examine* and *ap-  
 “prove* himself, and so <sup>a</sup> let him eat the Bread  
 “and drink the Cup (that is, let him commu-  
 “nicate *worthily*.) For he that eateth and drink-  
 “eth *unworthily*, not discerning the Lord’s Body,  
 “(not making the proper *Difference* between  
 “this sacred Feast upon the *Body and Blood of*  
 “*Christ*, and a *common Meal*) eateth and drink-  
 “eth *Condemnation* to himself. For this Cause  
 “many among you are sick and weak, and many  
 “sleep.” Because ye have presumed to eat and  
 drink *Unworthily*, and have thereby made your-  
 selves guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,  
 ye have been plagued with diverse Diseases, and  
 sundry Kinds of Death. “For if we would judge  
 “ourselves in this Matter, we should not be so  
 “judged as to be punished by the Lord. But  
 “when we are judged of the Lord, we are on-

<sup>a</sup> Οὕτω δε φάγεσθαι. And thus shall ye eat it. *Exod.* XII. 11.

“ly



“ly chastened by him, that we should not be  
 “condemned with the World.” Even these Vi-  
 sitations are the kind Corrections of a Father, to  
 reclaim us here, that we may not be condemned  
 with the unbelieving World hereafter. “Where-  
 fore *my Bretheren*, (a winning Appellation this)  
 “when ye *come together to eat* (the *Lord's-Sup-*  
*per*) *ἐνδεχέσθε Receive* one another.” Our pub-  
 lic Translation says, *tarry* one for another. But  
 how could they *wait* for each other, when they  
 were already *met together*? Or how could the  
 Apostle exhort the poor to *wait for the rich*,  
 when, according to the Translation, the rich  
*were assembled before the poor*? The Duty here  
 recommended was plainly reciprocal, and re-  
 spected both Parties, the poor as well as the  
 rich. The rich, we have seen, despised their  
 poorer Bretheren, and excluded them from the  
*Lord's Table*. And the poor, no Doubt, had  
 their Resentments against the rich. The Apostle  
 therefore presseth upon Both mutual Benevo-  
 lence. *Receive ye one another*. We meet with  
 the same Exhortation elsewhere. *Receive one a-*  
*nother, as Christ also hath received us.* \* If Christ

Rom. XV. 7 The Greek Word is not the same in this Place.  
 But *δέχομαι* in this Sense occurs frequently, both simple and com-  
 pound. See *Mat.* 7. 14. *Phil.* II. 29. *Col.* IV. 10. 3 *John.* X.

H

hath

hath received us, we ought also to receive one another. If *He* hath condescended to style us *Brethren*, and to treat us as *Friends*, we ought also to *love as Brethren*, and to *walk in the House of God as Friends*; and as a Mark of our Esteem and Friendship to communicate with each other at the Lord's Table. "And if any Man hunger, let him eat at Home, that ye come not together to Condemnation." Let the *hungry* provide for their *natural* Wants, and satisfy their *bodily* Appetites in *their own* Houses. The *Church* is not the Place for it. Otherwise you will come together to your own Condemnation. Your very Table will become a Snare. And the Things, which should have been for your Health, will be to you an Occasion of falling.

I have dwelt the longer on this Point, not merely to let you into the true Design of the Apostle's Argument, but likewise to shew You, that *Charity* is of prime Importance in the Religion of a Christian. Whithout it Faith is vain. Zeal for the Cause of God and Religion is of none Effect. And the Force of our Prayers is turned against ourselves. Our Saviour's Advice on a like Occasion is very applicable to the present. *Therefore if thou bring thy Gift to the Altar, and there rememberest that thy Brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy Gift before the Altar,*

Altar, and go thy Way; *first be reconciled to thy Brother*, and then come and offer thy Gift.

And here I cannot but observe, that a Want of Charity is by no Means an Excuse for not communicating. To communicate, and to communicate worthily, are Duties alike indispensable. Indeed, of the two Evils, it is better not to communicate at all, than to communicate uncharitably. Only let me remind you, that the very same Disposition of Mind, which excludeth you from the Lord's Table here, will for ever exclude you from it hereafter.

And as *Charity* thus teacheth us to *forgive*, to *think*, and to *speak well* of every one, so will the same Divine Principle incline us likewise to *do well* to every one. As it *thinketh no Evil*, so it *rejoiceth in doing Good* — it *gladly distributes*, *willingly communicates*, and by that Means *layeth up in Store a good Foundation against the Time to come*.

With these Qualifications, of *Repentance*, *Faith*, and *Charity*, ye will be, at all Times, *meet Partakers of these holy Mysteries*. Let me persuade you, as ye would not be thought destitute of either of them, to pay a willing and regular Attendance at the Lord's Table. It is your Interest — It is your Duty. And there is the greater Reason to press the Necessity of this



Service, because the Doctrine of *Redemption* is every Day *exploded* by some, and *explained away* by others. It is our Duty therefore constantly to *shew forth the SACRIFICE of Christ* in a constant Celebration of the FEAST *upon it*. Thus shall we secure to ourselves an Interest in his Sufferings. And though *Christ crucified* should still remain inconsistent with the low Ambition of a carnal *Jew*, and the boasted Refinements of a conceited *Moralist*, yet will he approve himself to all his faithful Disciples THE WISDOM as well as THE POWER OF GOD UNTO SALVATION.

F I N I S.

## An additional Note.

*Do this* — is as positive and expresses a *Command* &c. Page 46.

Robert Barclay tells us, that the Ceremony of *washing one another's Feet*, if we respect the *Command* injoining the *Use* of it, hath *as much* to recommend it for a *standing Ordinance* of the Gospel, as *eating Bread* and *drinking Wine*. And again, if we respect the *Nature of the Thing* it hath *as much* in it as the *breaking of Bread*; seeing it is an *outward Element* of a *cleansing Nature*, applied to the *outward Man*, by the *Command* and the *Example* of Christ, to *signify an inward purifying*. — Here the Quaker, in his Zeal against *Sacraments*, either accidentally or wilfully mistakes the Meaning of the *Action*, and interprets it as an Emblem of *Purification*, whereas it was in Truth an Emblem of *Humility*. What our Saviour said about *cleansing* was addressed particularly to *Peter*, and was merely *incidental*, being occasioned by some Interruptions from that forward Disciple. But the *Action* itself was occasioned by the general *Ambition* of the *Twelve*. Christ, at the Institution of his Supper, had twice mentioned a *Kingdom*. This kindled proud Thoughts in the Breasts of the Apostles, and each of them was seeking the Preeminence in it. There was *even a Strife* among them, as St. *Luke* reports, which of them should be the *Greatest*. To give a Check therefore to these *aspiring*, and to teach them *bumbler* Notions, such as were more becoming the Followers of a *Crucified Redeemer*, the meek and humble *Jesus* — agreeably with the *Custom* of those Times of conveying Instruction by *ACTIONS* as well as *Words* — condescended even to the lowest Office of *washing their Feet*. Then he said unto them, Know ye what I have *done* unto you? Understand ye what this *Action* meaneth? Ye call me *Master* and *Lord*; and ye say well, for so I am. If I then your *Lord* and *Master* have washed your Feet, ye also ought to wash one another's

ther's Feet. *For I have given you an Example, that ye should do as I have done to you.* i.e. I have taught you by *Example* as well as *Precept*, by *Actions* as well as *Words*, to be *humble*. Verily, verily I say unto you, *the Servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.* The Import of the *Action*, you see, was *Humility*. And so *St. Luke* will tell us; for *St. John* and *He* are speaking of the very same Thing. One relates the *Action*, both explain it. He said unto them, (after their *striving for Superiority*) The Kings of the *Gentiles* exercise *Lordship* over them. But *ye shall not do so*; but he that is *greatest* among you let him be as the *younger*, and he that is *chief* as he that *serveth*. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at Meat, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at Meat? But *I am among you as he that serveth*. — I say, the Import of the *Action*, and consequently of the *Command*, was *Humility*. And therefore whoever discovers a *humble* Disposition, in any Instance, fulfills the Import of this particular *Action*, and excuses the *Command* of Christ. This Observation may be farther illustrated by another Instance of a like Nature. In that famous Vision of *unclean* Creatures (and the Thing being transacted in a *Vision* makes no Alteration in the Case) *Peter* was expressly commanded to kill and eat. The Vision imported, that the *Legal Distinction* between *Jews* and *Gentiles* was now taken away. And, I presume, no one will deny, that *Peter* executed the *Divine Command* when he conversed with *Cornelius* and other *Gentiles*, though he did not literally eat of the *unclean Thing*. But whatever Notion others may entertain of the *Command*, *Peter* himself understood it in this Sense, as appears from his Discourse to *Cornelius* and his *Gentile* Friends. Ye know, says he, that it is *unlawful for a Jew to keep Company with, or come unto one of another Nation*. But God hath shewed me, hath commanded me by a *significative Action*, that I should not call any Man *common* or *unclean*. — These two Commands are exactly parallel to each other; and the Import of Both was the *only* Thing to be regarded.

But



But the Case is widely different with Regard to that other *Action* of *eating Bread*, and the *Command* to *do so*. In the *Church* a *standing* Information of Christ's Death is necessary. And therefore the very *Action* itself, *significant* of it, must be continually *repeated*. For, let Enthusiasts say what they please, the *visible Church* must have an external *visible Service*. My Author allows this. God forbid! says he, that I should think of putting away all set *Times* and *Places* to Worship. To *meet together* we think *necessary* for the People of God, because, so long as we are *cloathed* with this *outward Tabernacle*, there is a *Necessity* to the entertaining of a joint and *visible Fellowship*, and bearing of an *outward* Testimony for God, and seeing of the Faces of one another, that we concur with our *Persons* as well as *Spirits*. But how is it possible to maintain a *visible Fellowship* without some *visible Actions*? How is it possible for us to profess, in a *visible* Manner, that we are Members of a Body, the Head of which is a *Crucified Saviour*, unless we perform the *visible Actions* of *eating Bread* and *drinking Wine*, which He himself hath appointed for the *shewing forth* of his *Death*? *Vocal Prayers* are not *visible*, and therefore cannot answer the Purpose of keeping up a *visible Communion*. And indeed why significant *Words* should be lawful, and significant *Actions* unlawful in the Church of Christ, exceeds all the Powers of Logic to prove. Both alike belong to the *outward* Man, and convey, by different Modes of Expression, the Thoughts of the *inward*. And as to the particular *Action* of *eating Bread*, it is expressly appointed to be the *standing Ordinance* in the *Christian Church*, to *shew forth* the Sacrifice of Him who died for it. — He that hath Ears to hear, let him hear what *the Spirit* sayth unto the Churches.



181



